

SECRET

Subject: VOLYNETS (VOLYNETS), Chrystyna of Cleveland, Ohio
Her trips to Ukraine in 1965

Date: 16 Sept 1965

1. This is a summary report on Subject's second trip to the Ukraine from 15 to 30 July 1965, and partly on her first trip there from 16 to 27 April 1965, based on three interviews -

- a/ of 9 Aug 1965 made by T. in Munich (about 40 minutes)
- b/ of 24 Aug 1965 made by George in Rochester, N.Y. (30 minutes),
- and c/ of 4 Sept 1965 made by George at Subject's home in Cleveland, Ohio from 11.30 to 12.45 hrs.

(On her first trip see report dtd 21 May 1965.)

2. On her second trip to the Soviet Union - from 15 to 30 July 1965 - Subject visited by air Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and Lvov, in order. On 30 July 1965 she already left by train from Lvov for Przemysl, where she stayed for 24 hours and visited her relatives. Then she proceeded by train and plane to Vienna, Austria, and from there to West Germany.

3. While in Kiev Subject sent a telegram to Stanislav Fedorovich SLAVINSKY, alias (as a poet) STANISLAV KORSUN, Ukrainian, aged 24, student and poet whose works however had not been published as yet, though some of them had already been read and enjoyed applause at various poetry meetings in Kiev. SLAVINSKY was the one whom she met on her first visit to Kiev at the hotel-restaurant on her own initiative and who turned out ^{to be} one of "interesting students". According to previous arrangements she addressed the telegram to Kiev, Main Post Office, "Do zapytannia" on Slavinsky's name. While waiting for Slavinsky's reply Subject did some sightseeing in Kiev and again on her initiative came in contact with a young Ukrainian by the name KHACHENKO Viktor, bus-driver, of average intelligence, who kept her company almost for the whole day.

Next day when there was still no answer from SLAVINSKY, Subject went to the Dormitory where he was living. On the way there by bus - the Dormitory was located far away from the city - she entered into conversation with a young man by the name BERLAND Yefim. After she told him where she was going and that she was looking for an acquaintance, BERLAND volunteered to accompany her to the Dormitory and help in finding him. He spoke Russian, and had been already in the bus when Subject got on it.

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

BERLAND knew personally ~~some~~ Slavinsky, as it turned out later on. At the door they were told where Slavko lived. However, he was not in his room and instead they met a young student, a beatnik-type, who talked in Russian and told them in a harsh manner that he did not know where Slavko was ^{at the present} ~~was~~, "maybe even he sits now (in prison)..." Subject who kept silent until then, started to talk in Ukrainian ^{and} the young student became more friendly and suggested that they go to Slavko's grandfather. The latter might know where Slavko was at the present. Subject and BERLAND went to Slavko's grandfather but the latter did not know anything about his grandson's whereabouts.

Two days later SLAVINSKY came himself to Subject's hotel in company of another young man whom he introduced as his friend. He apologized for being late and explained that he was now serving with the Army and got two days leave in Kiev. This was also his explanation for his shaggy head.

Asked about another friend of SLAVINSKY whom Subject met together with him on her first trip - ANDREYIV T. - SLAVINSKY told her that he had left in the meantime for Moscow. Incidentally, ANDREYIV had signed his name together with SLAVINSKY on an engraving-reprint of Khvylovyi, they presented with Subject, together with 13 other engraving-reprints, mostly "ex libris". ANDREYIV was also present when SLAVINSKY gave Subject some books (mostly poetry) she brought with her, and a poem by himself (Slavinsky) in handwriting. The poem is entitled Kievskia osia, a lyrical, non-political story. SLAVINSKY asked her, however, not to give it to anybody and not to publish.

Subject thought SLAVINSKY was OK - as to his reliability - at least when she met him on her first trip. Now she was somewhat puzzled by his "service with ^{the} Army" and his general behaviour. Particularly she was alerted by his statements to the effect that he was a Soviet citizen and she had to treat him as such, that he was a Soviet patriot, and it didn't matter for him whether he was serving here in Kiev or in Kazakhstan. "We have to serve our country wherever it is necessary to defend her" also, etc.

Another fact that puzzled Subject occurred during their visit to the Dynamo-Club where she went together with SLAVINSKY and his friend. Incidentally, both were all the time in civilian. While at the Club SLAVINSKY noticed two men nearby talking Ukrainian and began to ask them where they were from, what were they (doing here) also. According to Subject, SLAVINSKY did it in such a way as though he was interrogating them. It turned out that one of them was from West Ukraine, spent 10 years in prison, and now was living in Kiev. He was like his friend around 50.

SECRET

SECRET

Subject pretended to be from Lviv and the one from West Ukraine started asking her various questions about the people there. Subject passed this "exam" quite successfully, so that he even asked her to convey his greetings to a Laryssa, a friend of O.KULCHYESKA whom Subject knew indeed. When she suggested that he maybe better should write to Laryssa, he replied that better not to.

SLAVINSKY was the one who started to "interrogate" the other two men but SLAVINSKY'S new friend was no less insistent in his questions than SLAVINSKY, and Subject did wonder very much why they were doing it in such a strict manner and moreover why the other two bothered to respond.

4. Still during her first visit to Kiev SLAVINSKY told her a story that she found it "useful" to repeat now to George. End 1964 or early 1965 there was a ^{public} debate at Kiev University on the role of youth, literature, and. Among those present were also some poets and writers. There were also DZIUBA, ~~and~~ SLAVINSKY. The debate began somewhat "feebly" until SLAVINSKY and ANDREYIV made their speeches. The latter introduced himself as a student of Moscow University, and both "fanned up the debate". After them all the speakers became quite outspoken in their utterances and the debate got really hot. In the meantime, however, both SLAVINSKY and ANDREYIV - left the meeting. Later on, Alla HORSKA reproached them for such an action moreover that many students were afterwards interrogated by the KGB. SLAVINSKY, when telling this story to Subject, said that he wondered himself why they (the KGB) did not interrogate him as well. The story was also told Subject by HORSKAY.

5. On her second visit to Kiev Subject saw no one of interest except for SLAVINSKY who actually seemed to her now somewhat less interesting than previously and had much less to tell her than during her first visit. As mentioned before, she met him together with ANDREYIV Taras (S) at her hotel restaurant during dancing. Looking at their (SLAVINSKY'S and Andreyiv's table she "simply invited them to invite her to dance". Then they started to talk and the friendship developed. SLAVINSKY introduced her to other students and confided to her about student activities, SYmonenko, etc. He described him as a young friendly man, very sympathetic, aged 24, 5'8, dark blond, longish face, slim. He also gave her his picture. His friend ANDREYIV - 6'1, brown hair, slim, longish face, strongly built.

SECRET

SECRET

SLAVINSKY introduced Subject to Alla HORSKA. Subject was at the latter's studio, saw two beds, was told that Alla was married but Subject did not know her husband. There she also met a young female student from Lviv, a friend of Alla. Subject was told by Alla herself that she "was born as a Ukrainian" only in 1962 (in the sense that she became a good patriot). HORSKA showed Subject her project of the ^{Symonenko}stair-window that was destroyed at the University in Kiev. According to HORSKA it was mainly destroyed because of patriotic inscription on it. "They (the regime) - couldn't HORSKA - don't like the inscription which might inspire people to thinking." The project itself was about 2m x 2,5 m in size.

SLAVINSKY tried also to introduce Subject to DZIUBA, Ivan but the latter refused to meet her telling that so "it's like better for her (Subject) and for me as well". In Kiev Subject was told that on an order of Moscow DZIUBA was given a new apartment and sent to Sochi on the Black Sea. "They gave him new apartment, with listening devices, of course, so that now they could watch him even better". "They don't give ^{him} however, any job".

In Kiev Subject visited HONCHAR Ivan, the young sculptor whose studio looked like a "museum". He is also one of "interesting young people" like HORSKA and other.

6. SLAVINSKY, HORSKA and other students, both in Kiev and Lviv, knew about the publication of Symonenko's poetry abroad and were very appreciative for that. They told her also about the Arson of the Kiev Library and that there was a leaflet about it.

They gave her also to read the speech of DZIUBA he had held in Kiev on the anniversary of Symonenko's death in 1964. The students in Kiev wanted her to smuggle it but she was afraid to take it. They also gave several poems but she only read them and returned. She was ~~also~~ told that KOSTENKO was not being printed now because she did not want to enter into any compromise with "them" (authorities).

Finally she only took 15 books and guide books, 14 engraving-reprints, mostly "Ex libris" and Slavinsky's poem "Kievskaya osin".

DZIUBA'S speech was very patriotic and mainly attacked "those who today pretend to be friends of the late poet while in reality they were always against him and hunted him". "Actually, he ^(Symonenko) was not the only one, because they (authorities) continue to do the same with his living friends - Kostenko and others. DZIUBA attacked particularly those among Ukrainians who "were hunting Symonenko", touched on some general political topics and the situation in the Ukraine and finished it with "Then, finally, you - cursed slaves - will

SECRET

perish?"

Everybody was sure that after that speech DZIUBA would be arrested. For two weeks students watched his house in order to make an entry in case the KGB decided to take him away. Instead, there came an order from Moscow - "Leave him and give an apartment..."

7. Subject denied that she had had a message from anyone from abroad for HORYN Bohdan (as it was assumed on the basis of the report of W. Sel. on her meeting with the latter in Lviv - see Report on W. S. dtd 13 July 1963, p. 44). The message was from SLAVINSKYI and only a verbal one. Its genesis was the following: when in Kiev, Subject told SLAVINSKYI that she would like to buy some books and souvenirs in Lviv and wondered if anybody could help her. SLAVINSKYI suggested that she went to HORYN Bohdan and gave his address at the Museum in Lviv. She should convey Slavinsky's and his friends greetings to HORYN. The latter will certainly help her and besides, probably "tell her something interesting". After her arrival in Lviv, Subject went to the Museum. At the entrance she asked for HORYN and was told by a lady in Russian that he was not at the present at his office. Subject wrote then a small message saying, "Best greetings from friends in Kiev - Chrystyna". This was the only message she left for HORYN whom she did not even see.

8. SLAVINSKYI and other described KOROTYCH Vitali as "an average poet, nothing special". Her impression was that KOROTYCH was not liked. SLAVINSKYI told her that he had heard that KOROTYCH had accomplished in Canada more than "the whole bunch of agents".

9. When asking Subject about Ukrainian activities abroad, the students in Kiev wanted to know whether Ukrainian emigration had any contacts with Jews. In their opinion it was very important to establish friendly relations with Jewish circles "because they were very influential in international politics". They told Subject that emigres should publish more in foreign languages and inform the Western world about the situation in the Ukraine.

10. During her first visit, on the train from Kiev to Lvov, Subject had met a girl student and a peasant from KONOTOP. Subject asked him about kolhospny and whether it was true that people would refuse to divide them. The peasant confirmed it. Later on, when the girl student got off, he told Subject that he was telling her lies. He also complained against Russians

and it was a girl from West Ukraine in his town who "had enlightened him and made conscious (Ukrainian)". He was about 40 and studied agriculture on some evening courses for "advancing of qualifications".

11. During her second visit to LVOV Subject did not see Dr TYMCHYSHYN because at that time he was in Poland, in KATOWICE, where he spent several days with his daughter Tamara TYMCHYSHYN of Cleveland, Ohio and Olga HANYTSKA of Reichshof, near Innsbruck, Austria (See separate Report on that, on Hanytska.)

Subject saw Dr TYMCHYSHYN on her first visit for a few days and he also introduced her to his friend Dr or Mgr Jurka DURNIAK, in LVIV. Subject was at DURNIAK'S home and met there his family - wife and children. On her second visit to LVOV, DURNIAK waited for her in ~~front of~~ ^{the} Inturist Hotel and told her that he knew about her sojourn in Lviv from his children he has seen her in the street. He came to tell ^{her} that after her first visit he (DURNIAK) was interrogated by the KGB who wanted to know where from he knew Subject and what she wanted from him. DURNIAK told them that she was with her uncle (Dr TYMCHYSHYN) and said nothing about her impressions on meetings with students in Kiev. Actually, Subject was talking a lot about Kiev students while at DURNIAK'S house and Dr TYMCHYSHYN was quite frightened by what he had heard from Subject. DURNIAK, however, thought that these students (in Kiev) were "good boys". DURNIAK was quite surprised why the KGB bothered him now. He also told Subject that the KGB had interrogated her uncle - Dr TYMCHYSHYN - but this was not surprising to either, as Dr T. was a former prisoner and had much to do with the KGB.

During her stay with Dr TYMCHYSHYN in Lviv, the latter gave her requirements and wishes to the emigration and some of points he had dictated. She re-dictated them now to George:

A. Mutual exchange of thoughts and opinions and rapprochement of the two worlds - emigration and the people - is being well received and desired for further strengthening of this rapprochement;

B. There is a wide campaign going on in the press on all levels, up to academicians including, for defence, and purity and culture of Ukrainian language. Such masters as "Dobre voshaluy" (half Russian, half Ukrainian) are being liquidated.

C. Ukraine - is not Munich and Washington but Kiev and Lviv. Ukrainian nation is not you but us here (in the Ukraine) regardless of what were are like and in what position were are. Only on the basis of these premisses and taking into account our position as well as starting from it, you can be considered to be our own blood and home and should do all to

SECRET

help our land just like, for instance, the Polish emigration is doing. The latter - regardless of its political and social convictions - without exception does help their Polish Fatherland which is also as democratic and socialist as ours.

We here, can only repeat the words of Pope: seek what unites you and build it up, and avoid all that divides you.

Subject commented that she did not know whether Dr Tymchyshyn was dictating that on his own volition or maybe someone told him to do so.

12. About STEPANIAK Subject was told the following by Dr TYMCHYSHYN: a/ After his release from prison the KGB asked STEPANIAK with whom he would like eventually to get into contact. They suggested many people to him but he refused to have anything to do with them. Finally they asked him about Dr TYMCHYSHYN and STEPANIAK gladly agreed to "join him". They were friends from old times.

b/ STEPANIAK and TYMCHYSHYN "refused to sign" and held out. STEPANIAK enjoys a great respect on the part of high officials in Kiev. They often visit him or ask him to come to Kiev "for consultation". He advises them and they do always the opposite. STEPANIAK continues also to demand more independence for Ukraine, a separate Ukrainian Army, money, etc. During his last visit to Kiev "for consultation", he had to write an article. The foreword was not by him but "they" did it themselves.

c/ STEPANIAK would not have seen Subject anyway because he does not want to complicate his matters.

d/ STEPANIAK was given no job, contrary to KUK who had agreed to collaborate with Kiev. STEPANIAK wrote nothing after Subject's first visit and probably would not correspond with anybody but HANYTSKA Olga of Austria, her aunt.

13. SLAVINSKY asked Subject whether she knew Roxana SMISHKEVICH from the Satets who was with American Exhibit in Kiev and gave them (students) many books. Subject did not know her and only now at Plast-Camp learned that SMISHKEVICH was living in New Jersey.

SECRET

14. According to Subject [REDACTED]'s desiderata and opinions are probably the same as STEPANIAK'S. She is sur that Dr TYMCHYSHYN must have discussed those problems with STEPANIAK.

15. Dr TYMCHYSHYN, as well as students in Kiev, asked for more publications in foreign languages to inform the Western World about their position in the Ukraine. Thus, Subject was told that Russification drive continued and, for instance, in MYKOPOLZHA among 20 middle schools there was only one Ukrainian. "You should make an outcry about such facts" - she was told.

Ad DZIUBA'S Speech: When Subject was given it, she took it with her to the hotel. It was late at night and she was going to read it next day. When she entered the lobby, the porter had asked her why she was coming so late and what she had with her. She had "Dnipro"-magazine with Dziuba's speech inside, and told him that she had bought the magazine at the Kiosk. The porter did not ask her anymore. Next day she read the speech but left it again in the hotel as she did not want it to have on her. Only the day after she returned it to SLAVINSKY. Told by George that she should not have done it, Subject replied that she made a check in her suitcase and was sure no one took it out.

16. Subject is an intelligent, young, attractive girl with a great dose of common sense though lacking of necessary political and other experience required in the situation she met ^{with} in the Ukraine. Despite her quite negative impressions from her second trip, she is still quite happy about her visits to Ukraine and wouldn't mind going there again. Actually, Shipka-Agency of Cleveland suggested to her to head a tourist group next year and she might agree to.

SECRET